DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 018 JC 740 459

AUTHOR	Command, Edward M.
TITLE	Governance in Higher Education. A Bibliography.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Olympia.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Annotated Bibliographies; *Bibliographies; *College Administration; College Faculty; Colleges; College Students; *Governance; *Higher Education; *Publications; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Resources Information Center; ERIC

ABSTRACT

The intent of this bibliography is to assist the reader to determine some of the important questions and concerns of higher educational governance and to serve as an example of the variety of sources on the topic. It consists of a collection of recent ERIC items and books on the subject. Nine areas of governance are considered: (1) The General Topic of Governance, (2) Governing Boards, (3) The Office of the College or University President, (4) The Administration and Governance, (5) The Faculty and Governance, (6) The Students and Governance, (7) Coordination Personnel Boards, (8) Governments and Colleges and University Governance, and (9) The Question of Freedom and Order in Higher Education. The entries under each area are not intended to be either comprehensive or complete. ERIC items are identified by the month and volume number. (Author/DB)

ED 099013

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

. A BIBLIOGRAPHY

JC 740 459

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

During 1970, Dr. Edward M. Command prepared this bibliography of references on governance in higher education while he was serving as a consultant to the State Board for Community College Education. The State Board has reprinted the document because of the renewed interest in governance among Washington community colleges. Dr. Command is currently serving as Assistant to the President's Office at Highline Community College in Midway, Washington.

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this bibliography is to assist the reader to determine some of the important questions and concerns of higher educational governance and to serve as an example of the variety of sources on the topic. It consists of a collection of recent ERIC items and books on the subject. Nine areas of governance are considered:

1. The General Topic of Governance
2. Governing Boards
3. The Office of the College or University President
4. The Administration and Governance
5. The Faculty and Governance
6. The Students and Governance
7. Coordinating Personnel Boards
8. Governments and Colleges and University Governance
9. The Question of Freedom and Order in Higher Education.

The entries under each area are not intended to be either comprehensive or complete but may serve as a starting place for further investigation in a specific area.

ERIC items are identified by the month and volume number above a bibliography entry.

THE GENERAL TOPIC OF GOVERNANCE

BARZUN, JACQUES. "Tomorrow's University--Back to the Middle Ages," Saturday Review, November 15, 1969.

Three possible types of university governance were explored. The first is the student run university as exemplified by the Medieval universities of Bologna and Paris. The second is government controlled university system for which no specific example was given. The third is essentially a faculty controlled university which Mr. Barzun feels we are presently giving up because of pressures for student involvement in university affairs and university involvement in political and social affairs. The major point being made is that more student involvement in university affairs ultimately leads to restrictive government control and not to the ultimate conditions for a western university, i.e., the freedom to teach and the freedom to learn.

BLOCKER, CLYD E. and CLARENCE H. SCHAUER. "The Formal and Informal Structures of a College and a Business Organization: An Analysis." Harrisburg, Penn., 1965. (Research project completed at the University of Texas as a part of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation Junior College Leadership Program.)

The purpose of the study was to identify and analyze the formal and informal organization structures within a four-year, state-supported college and a business organization; to determine the compliance of the formal to the informal organization structures within each institution; and to compare the formal organization structure, the informal organization structure, and the compliance of the formal to the informal organization structures of a four-year, state-supported college to that of a business organization. Some of the conclusions were that the focal person in both organizations was the president, that the college dean of students and the business treasurer were most influential in the informal structure, that the secretarial personnel exhibited more activity and influence in both organizations than was realized, and that there was much more interdepartmental communication in the college than in the business.

CAFFREY, JOHN. "Predictions for Higher Education in the 1970's," Washington, D. C., 1968. (Paper presented at the 51st Annual Meeting of American Council on Education, 1968.)

For the American Council on Education's 51st meeting, the theme "The Future Academic Community" was chosen. The opinions and ratings of five groups of educational leaders were sought on the probability and desirability of a set of hypothetical events, conditions, or developments in 1968-78. The groups whose responses were solicited included institutional members of the American Council on Education, other members of the Council (mostly associations and organizations), members of governing boards, and faculty and student leaders. The thirty-five events were selected to reflect concern with such issues as the nature and distribution of the student population, federal and other financial support, curriculum and instruction, graduate output and its distribution, modes of internal governance, the general structure of higher education and socio-economic factors. Although there was low response from trustees and student leaders, the data provided a basis for discussion of the issues and future alternatives in higher education.

CLARK, BURTON R. "The Alternatives Paranoia or Decentralization," Stress and Campus Response, G. Kerry Smith, Editor, San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Mr. Clark feels that the current causes of the problems of campus governance center around the rapid rate at which campuses have been growing in size and complexity, the limitations on individual involvement in policy formation, and the situation of the faculty identifying with their respective departments rather than the faculty senate or other university-wide bodies. The fundamental change necessary to alleviate these problems is to change the basic organizational structure of the campus to quasi-autonomous, relatively small units of administrators, faculty, and students. These units would not necessarily follow the departmental pattern presently in effect but could be based on any rationale conducive to educational purposes.

April 1969, Volume 4, Number 4

CORSON, JOHN J. "From Authority to Leadership," Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, November 11, 1968. (Paper presented at conference of National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., November 11, 1968.)

Colleges and universities are experiencing the consequences of the technological, urbanization and human rights revolutions that have plagued American society during the '60's. Enrollments have increased, new emphasis is placed on reorientation of curricula, teaching practices, specialization, and admission requirements. The university's size, function and relation to its environment has been considerably transformed; however, to meet modern societal needs, it must also alter the traditional management of its affairs. Obstacles to this change include the lack of communication between professors of different disciplines, the power of departments and boards in decision making, presidents who lack administrative abilities, the struggle to remain autonomous, and the inability to deal with student needs. The authority to decide on this change rests only with the president, yet the character of his position almost precludes his taking charge. He must, therefore, redistribute this authority among faculty members, trustees, students, alumni, coordinating boards and himself in order to administrate university affairs more effectively.

CORSON, JOHN J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.., 1960.

This study of governance in American colleges and universities deals with how the power to make decisions is distributed and exercised with respect to the education and research program, student affairs, faculty affairs, external relations such as governmental and public relations. The author has tried to visualize the nature of the process of government itself and the characteristics of academic institutions that dictate the kinds of governance appropriate to them. He identifies the characteristics which characterize the college and university as a social organization and the roles of trustees, presidents, deans, department heads and faculty in this organization. Consideration is also given to the manner in which the institution adapts its curriculum, courses and processes to the significant pressures from government, accrediting agencies, foundations, donors and specific developments in society.

ELLIOTT, LLOYD H. "Changing Internal Structures: The Relevance of Democracy." (Paper presented at 51st Annual Meeting of American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1969.)

Because the scene of the struggle to control men's minds has shifted from other battlefields to the university, the university must reappraise its role and responsibilities as a democratic institution within a democracy. The important question is not "who shall govern the university," but "for what end shall the university be governed." Procedures must be established to nurture the pursuit of truth in the academic program, the most fundamental work of the university. Institutional reform may be approached in two major ways. One is to create a departmental advisory body comprised of professors, students, alumni, and the public. Its duty would be to formulate recommendations for change in the academic program which would then be presented to the department chairman and faculty. A byproduct of this arrangement would be increased communication among constituencies as new and closer working relationships were established. The second area of reform involves the total abolishment of the concept of "in loco parentis." Academic freedom must be firmly upheld so that all voices may be heard. Participation in governance calls for objectivity and personal responsibility, for the effectiveness of the institutional structure will depend on the extent to which individuals can accommodate themselves to the university and its goals.

GARDINER, DAVID P. "The Power Struggle to Convert the University," Educational Record, Spring, 1969, pp. 113-120.

This article reviews the evolution of university government, the relationship of the university to the industrial-political state, the meaning of academic freedom in terms of the relationship, and things which must be considered when judging questions of university transformation and control. Dr. Gardiner believes that the American university is presently engaged in a power struggle to convert it from a concern with satisfying governmental and industrial needs to that of discovering ways of alleviating social injustice and providing a more individually meaningful and valid education for students. He feels that the turmoil in American higher education results not so much from efforts to destroy it as from the competition of its suitors whose dissimilar aims and values impinge directly on the freedoms which have been associated with the old structure. While much should be negotiable in the transformation of the university, the intellectual freedom of the faculty is not.

GIBSON, RAYMOND. The Challenge of Leadership in Higher Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1964.

This text book on philosophical foundations, organization and administration, and financing of higher education contains most of the usual topics of the administration of higher education but stresses the need for administrators to have a liberal education and a basic conventional philosophy for what they are doing. The discussions are process and future-oriented and offer what the author feels are desirable models for the administering and financing of higher education.

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 8

GOVERNANCE OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA. Report to Academy for Educational Development, Inc., New York, and the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento, October, 1968.

The report, prepared by the Academy for Educational Development as part of an extensive review of California's 1959 Master Plan for Higher Education, contains recommendations for the future governance (including the present system) and examined in an attempt to select the one that would resolve most of the immediate problems facing higher education in the state. Fourteen criteria were formulated to serve as a framework within which the overall analysis was made, and as the basis for appraising the advantages and disadvantages of the eight plans. The existing public higher education system consists of three independent public segments (universities, colleges and junior colleges), coordinated by a statewide board with primarily advisory powers. The recommended system would have two independent public segments, one containing all public institutions granting baccalaureate and graduate degrees (colleges and universities), and another granting only associate degrees (junior colleges), coordinated by a statewide board. It is felt that this system would, among other things, simplify the financial structure and remove arbitrary barriers to development. The establishment of regional committees for furthering interinstitutional cooperation is also suggested, as well as advisory boards for keeping abreast of problems and deeds of each four-year campus.

HESTER, JAMES M. "Pressures on the Urban University Today." (Paper presented at the Annual Dinner Meeting of the New York Group Investment Bankers Association of America, October 3, 1968.

In virtually all phases of our national life we are accepting new viewpoints that are reflected in student attitudes. Students are flocking to urban universities and demanding curricula that are related to peace, social justice, and domestic and world problems. A growing number of skeptical, moderate students are joining the hardcore destructive radicals to participate in student protest activities. Young faculty members have joined with the moderate student group to challenge the wisdom of decisions made by authoritative personnel and to demand participation in decision-making processes. Black students are demanding more information about black people in the United States. All of the demands are new, controversial, and potentially constructive. University response should not constitute a paternalistic defense of apology for past institutional philosophies but the creation of innovative programs to attack major problems and improve the "human experience." The range of skills and resources found at the university has always made it the natural place for solving wartime, medical, and scientific problems. Now it is confronted with social, legal, political, economic, psychological and educational problems which again provide it with an opportunity to contribute to national progress. It should, through analysis, criticism, and experimentation, formulate new concepts and ways to overcome the inequities and dislocations of our society.

May 1969, Volume 4, Number 5

HODGKINSON, HAROLD L. "Governance and Factions--Who Decides Who Decides?" *Research Reporter, Volume 3, Number 3, 1968.*

In several projects, the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, is studying the question: Who will decide which factions will be represented in the decision-making process? In the Campus Governance Project investigating the nature of governance, over 3,000 questionnaires were administered and 900 intensive interviews conducted at nineteen institutions. The questionnaire was designed to identify problems of governance and determine which individuals were considered knowledgeable and influential in dealing with them and how they became so. It was generally found that today's governance is more complex, more involved with negotiated exchange among internal and external factions than before. Presidents retain accountability for all that happens on their campus though their ability to control it has declined. Patterns are hard to change because most academicians believe that practices adopted by other institutions are inappropriate to their own, most change occurs by accretion, self interest rather than concern for the institution dominates decision making. Major sources of friction are the budget and distribution of information regarding it, delegation of authority, and the method of announcing decisions (particularly bad news). Extreme resentment was expressed against state education departments, presidents and deans of students. Among a number of suggestions for improving governance, the most widely adopted is that of a campus-wide governing body composed of representatives from all factions. Despite complaints, however, changes might provoke even greater dissatisfaction.

July 1969, Volume 4, Number 7

AN INDIANA PATTERN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: REPORT OF THE STATE POLICY COMMISSION ON POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION. Indianapolis, Indiana State Policy Commission on Post High School Education, December, 1968.

The commission recommended: (1) establishment by the General Assembly of a Board of Regents; (2) number and terms of Board Members; (3) setting the Regent's duties as (a) setting policy for public higher education, (b) making long range plans in coordination with private schools, (c) approving new schools and major changes of policy, (d) coordinating budget and accounting procedures, (e) handling federal funds, (f) appointing a Chancellor for administration, planning, and research, (g) setting up advisory councils and commissions; (4) development of comprehensive colleges with local control; (5) appointment of an Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions; (6) retaining the Clinical Teaching Center Program in the Health Professions; (7) conversion of regional state university campuses to autonomous institutions; (8) accountability to the Regents of all expenditures; (9) Regents control of federal funds for vocational/technical training; (10) transfer to the Regents of the Advisory Commission on Academic Facilities; (11) transfer of the duties of the Medical Education Board to the Regents, (12) placing the Indiana Higher Education Telecommunication System under the Regents; (13) transfer of duties of the Indiana Educational Services Foundation to the Regents; (14) ex-officio representation by the Regents on the Indiana Education Council; (15) expansion of the scholarship program; (16) cooperation with the Civil Rights Commission; (17) appointing a lay committee on private higher education.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

ISSUES IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE: A REPORT TO THE FORD FOUNDATION ON THE SUMMER COLLOQUIUM ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE. New York, Ford Foundation, September, 1968.

The Coloquium on issues in university governance was organized to identify and define major governmental issues facing U.S. colleges and universities and, following an inter-disciplinary analysis of the issues, to propose solutions or to determine next steps to be taken. Explanations that emerged as to why the governance of academic institutions has become an increasing source of debate were the inadequate adaptation of U.S. college and university structures to social change, the loss of academic institutions protective coat of isolation as they are drawn into the mainstream of U.S. life, the drastic shift of the institutional balance of power, the loss of college students bargaining power in influencing policies at their institutions, and the change in U.S. society and their influence on students of the late 1960's. It was also agreed that problems exist in university financing, curricular planning, institutional efficiency, and the adjudicating of differences of opinion about institutional purposes in order to lessen the conflict of over governance, inadequate analysis of the problems of governance, and insufficient understanding or knowledge of the data that exist on these problems. The recommendations in the report focus on these two problems. Summaries of the general sessions of the colloquium are appended.

LAW, GLEN CHARLES. The Urgency of New Leadership in Higher Education, Stanford Connecticut: Press-Tige Publishing, 1962.

The author explains that this book presents a point of view on important issues in higher education. It deals with the problems of faculty-administration relations and the roles of boards, administrators, faculties, alumni, government and the public in terms of the growing complexities affecting decision making in higher education. One of its main features in an exceptionally good bibliography of books concerning higher education up to 1962.

LIVINGSTON, JOHN C. "Faculty and Administrative Roles in Decision Making," Stress and Campus Response, G. Kerry Smith, Editor, San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968

Mr. Livingston is concerned with how to make organization in higher education serve people rather than people serving it. His suggestion for doing this is to grant administrators more power and to make their role in the organization that of a mediator. His pattern of organization is similar to the realm of politics rather than a corporation or a bureaucracy. The role of the faculty is that of a powerful self-interest group or lobby. The implication is that other groups within the university and society would then also have lobbying roles and the administrator would assist in mediating differences and implementing compromises and agreements within the university community. The problem with current university organization is that "both administrators and faculty tend still to feel that the problem is that the other is in the saddle and exercising arbitrary and unlimited power, when the real problem is that no one is in the saddle..."

June 1969, Volume 5, Number 6

MALIK, JOSEPH A. Decision-Making in Community Colleges. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon School of Education, November, 1968.

This study shows that the desire of faculty members to participate in administrative decision making varies with their field of specialization, sex, and years of educational experience. The field of specialization seems to have the most effect, academic instructors generally wanting a higher degree of participation than the teachers of vocational or technical subjects. Among the academic faculty, the men advocate more involvement than the women; among the applied faculty, the reverse is true. As the level of education of the faculty member increases, so does his interest in administrative decisions, those with advanced degrees being better trained for participation and more knowledgeable about the problems of an educational institution. Administrators should encourage the applied faculty to take more interest, if not in institutional decision making, at least in such other faculty activities as council and committee work. Since every faculty member can and should contribute to the development of an institution in his own way, it is up to the administrator to make it possible for him to do so.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

MONAHAN, EDWARD J. AND OTHERS. "Decision Making in Higher Education." Speeches given at the Summer Conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Dallas, Texas, July 1, 1968.

The paper contains shortened versions of five addresses given at the 1968 Summer Conference of the American Association for Higher Education. The Duff-Berdahl Report on University Government in Canada recommends a change in the balance of power within the structure of Canadian university government. Its proposals for reform include less board and administrative governance, increased faculty participation, and a closer relationship between Canadian university boards and academic senates. One address reviews the report and the implementation of some of its recommendations by a majority of Canadian universities, and another address presents the report's implications for the governance of U.S. colleges and universities. A third address analyzes the causes of student unrest and presents ways, within a proposed university structure of resolving issues that cause insurrections among students as well as other campus problems. The fourth paper deals with the meaning of governance, behavioral differences of individuals on various campuses, the value of conflict between teaching and research, meaningful communication on institution-wide problems, faculty attitudes toward governance, and administrative leadership. The fifth speech presents an analysis of typical students, and their concerns about the lack of responsiveness at their colleges and the need for relevance of higher education to society.

October 1969, Volume 4, Number 10

MUIRHEAD, PETER P. "Campus Insurgency: Evolution or Revolution." Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969. (This paper presented at annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.)

This paper concerns decision making, faculty evaluation, student characteristics, student participation, and student-school relationship in higher education. The author believes that today's younger generation is unique. Many are the products of affluence and many others come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Both sense a frustration and feel disillusioned with a society that rewards the rich and denies opportunities to the poor. The young share with other groups and institutions a deep sense of powerlessness which leads to violence. It is ineffective to reply to student violence simply by repression. College administrators must make every effort to establish communication with students and grant them responsibility. Never before have students been better prepared to have a voice in the decisions affecting them. Students should be given full responsibility for their personal conduct on and off campus and the opportunities to evaluate their faculty's teaching performance and participate in curriculum reform. The idealism of activist students should be welcomed, their right to dissent rigorously protected, and their alliance sought.

April 1969, Volume 4, Number 4

NILAND, WILLIAM PATRICK. "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal for Resolution." University of California, School of Education, Berkeley, August, 1964. (Unpublished study available from University Microfilms.)

This study identifies areas of administration-faculty conflict and offers a strategy for resolution. Information was collected by mail and interview. From the findings, inferences were drawn relating to the causes of conflict, as shown by the differences in perception of the administrator and teacher, in attitudes to the open-door policy, and in opinions on the efficacy of a senate in policy making. Conditions working for change in the present authority structure include not only the formation of teacher organizations, but also state legislation of funds for instruction and mandatory faculty senates. It is apparent that conflict, inevitable under some conditions can be alleviated if certain theoretical factors are considered. The administration faces three groups of faculty (activist, generally supportive, and complacent). By working with the middle group, the administration can discover the causes of the conflicts and work them out in a professional manner. Any agreement should include (1) recognition of the local faculty organization as agent, (2) establishment of channels of communication, (3) guarantee of room for negotiation, and (4) a stipulation of appellate procedures in cases of deadlock. The question in the junior colleges seems to be not whether school boards and administrators will negotiate with teachers but how they will do so.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

REVISED REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE. New York: State University of New York, Brighamton, March, 1969.

The Committee on University Governance of the State University of New York at Brighamton was established to investigate the institution's system of governance and the recommended changes that were necessary for instituting a system of communal governance. The Committee was composed of elected representatives from four groups: undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and administration. The Committee's report, based on the concept that the university is a community, presents a new form of governance in which authority and responsibility in university decision-making are shared by students, faculty, and administration. Section I details the structure of college, graduate school, and university assemblies. Section II to V cover educational policies, admissions, university personnel policy and procedures, and social regulations. Section VI recommends an integrated judicial system composed of four levels of boards, and specifies their respective areas of jurisdiction. Sections VII to IX discuss the rights and obligations of faculty, students, and administrators, amendment procedures for changing the overall structure of university governance and implementation of the proposals in the report. If the system is approved, it would be implemented not later than September 1969, reviewed at the end of three years of operation, and again ratified by the four constituencies.

October 1969, Volume 4, Number 10

SECOND INTERIM REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. New York: Columbia University, March 17, 1969.

The Special Committee of the Trustees of Columbia University was appointed "to study and recommend changes in the basic structure of the University." The second interim report contains recommendations of the committee on the participation of faculty and students in university governance through a proposed University Senate that would replace the existing University Council and the Advisory Committee of the Faculties to the President. Each school would be represented by at least one elected member in the Senate, and the President of the University would be the presiding officer. The powers and duties of this unicameral body would include those set forth in Sections 22 through 24 of the University's Statutes. The Senate would also have powers, with the concurrence of the trustees, to act in the area of faculty, students and staff conduct. These powers would be supplemented by the responsibility to propose and recommend courses of action in matters affecting more than one school of faculty, others surrounding university relations with its affiliates and matters of university-side concern. The committee also recommends that procedures be established whereby the Senate would be consulted on certain matters for which the trustees have the ultimate responsibility, and that additional opportunities be fostered at school, faculty, or departmental levels for meaningful faculty and student participation in university affairs.

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 8

WILLIAMS, D.C. "The Nature of the Contemporary University." Speech given before the Annual Meeting of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Ottawa, Canada, November 6, 1968.

The traditional concept of the university is being challenged today by students, faculty members, and the general public. The news media have tended to aggravate, inflate, and distort university events. In some cases this kind of reporting has made public figures of those student leaders who attempt to make the university an instrument of political action or others who would preserve its structure but seek the power to govern it. Faculty interested in governance has increased, and an outraged public condemns the university's "inability to keep its own house in order." The most obvious response to these pressures has been made by university presidents, who resign as their responsibilities increase and their authority diminishes. Another response concerns university governance. The two-tiered system, or the existence of a Board and a Senate with faculty and student participation, has been successfully attempted at the University of Western Ontario. The classroom response has been less dramatic. There seems to be no viable alternative to current lecture and examination systems, even though some efforts are being made to experiment with new teaching techniques. An important question concerns how the university may retain its autonomy while participating in governance within a system flexible enough to adapt to the rapid pace of change. It seems that the university has already begun to defend its aims with a new enthusiasm reminiscent of the intellectual revolution that produced it 100 years ago.

May 1969, Volume 4, Number 5

WILLIAMS, KENNETH R. "Leadership and Responsibility of the Changing Campus: Who's in Charge? The Role of the Faculty: A View from the President's Office." Panel presentation at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., November 1968.

Florida Atlantic University is successfully developing an organization which effectively utilizes administrators, faculty and students in institutional decision making. It is recognized that the well-being and effectiveness of the institution are dependent upon the extent to which the manner in which each member of the university family accepts his responsibilities, exercises his rights and authority, and performs his duties. A faculty committee drafted the constitution calling for a university senate composed of all members of the full-time faculty above the rank of instructor. The key steering and policy committee, composed of two faculty members from each college, serves as the screening body for all matters coming before the senate. Recently students have been added to several university committees and a committee of faculty, students and administrators was instituted to study and propose a new form of university governing structure. A twenty-one man group, selected from the faculty senate of each university in the state system, established a direct line of communication from the several university faculties to the board of regents. In general faculty have clearly demonstrated their willingness to assume the burdens of added responsibility that must accompany an increased involvement in policy making.

GOVERNING BOARDS

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

ANDERSON, CHARLES J. "Census of Governing Boards of Four-Year Colleges and Universities Final Report." Washington, D.C., Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, March 28, 1969. (Sponsering agency - Office of Education (DHEW), Washington D.C. Bureau of Research, Bureau No. BR-8-C-025).

The purpose of this investigation was to obtain the names and addresses of members of governing boards of all four-year colleges and universities in the U.S. in order to provide data on the distribution of trustees by sex, by state of institutions served, and by region of residence. The list was then to be recorded to serve as a universe for future studies of trustees and institutional governance. Data were obtained for 93 per cent of the 1,203 boards governing 1,423 four-year institutions. The membership lists contain 25,584 names of which approximately 90 per cent were men. The distribution of board members by state of institution governed and by region of residence varied widely, the largest number live in the mideast and the smallest in the Rocky Mountain area. This distribution generally reflects student enrollment and population patterns. The names and addresses of 24,900 board members are currently on file at the national headquarters of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington D.C. Information gathered during the study and references are included.

June 1969, Volume 4, Number 6

"APPROPRIATE FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OF THE LOCAL JUNIOR COLLEGE GOVERNING BOARDS." Sacramento, California: California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, December, 1968.

In 1967 California created a Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to assume the responsibilities then held by the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The law also directed the Coordinating Council for Higher Education to appoint a committee to recommend the proper functions of the new Board of Governors and of local school boards maintaining junior colleges. By the time the Board assumed its authority in July 1968, it had arranged for the transfer of personnel and function from the State Authorities. The Education Code was examined for all sections pertaining to junior colleges at both state and local levels, so that the necessary elimination or reassignment of authority could be anticipated. These changes would require major reorganization of the entire junior college structure, the Committee recommended a study, showing alternative structures and operations, to serve as a model for the final choice and meanwhile avoid ad hoc, unwise changes. It also recommended that certain conditions remain as before (instructional offerings, funding, etc.) and that some legislation, presently precluding the new Board's authority, be changed. Eighteen major functions each for the Board of Governors and the local junior college governing boards are suggested. The report shows which functions are changed, reassigned, new, or shared. Appended are the names of the Committee members and the full text of the Senate Bill creating the Board of Governors.

BROOKS, JAMES E. AND OTHERS. "The Role of the Administration and the Governing Board." Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, November, 1968, Educational Resources Information Center.

"A paper presented at the 8th Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., November 1968. Concerned administrator roles, educational objectives, faculty, governing boards, student participation, and leadership potential in higher education. The first of these four statements suggests that faculty and student involvement in institutional governance is a learning experience which, to be effective, needs the leadership of the administration. This leadership is lacking because of administrators' concern with the protection of their authority and their attitudes, among other things. The major administrative role, according to the second statement, is the determination of institutional goals. Another role should be to ensure the involvement of faculty, student, trustee, and administrative staff in the governing structure, with areas of authority and responsibility properly delineated. Four other administrative roles are proposed for keeping the university within sight of its goals. The chairman of a governing board presents some of his experiences in the third statement. Governing board members often feel that they lack sufficient information about the issues on which they make policy, especially when a multi-institutional system is involved. Administrators and trustees, when under pressure by public and the legislatures, need to select a meaningful challenge, accommodate to it, and resist the rest with tact, understanding, and firmness. The fourth statement suggests that the state coordinating board, with the governing boards and the administrations of institutions should develop statewide plans and share the responsibilities for meeting goals, problems, and challenges in higher education."

July 1968, Volume 4, Number 7

DUSTER, TROY. "The Aims of Higher Learning and the Control of the Universities." Berkeley, California: California University, 1966. (Sponsored by the California University, Berkeley, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education; Haynes Foundation Fellowship.)

"Contrary to popular belief, much power is vested in university governing boards that are usually composed of individuals not professionally concerned with higher education. The center conducted a study in 1965 of trustees at 38 member institutions of American Association of Universities, in an effort to expand previous findings on governing board members; social characteristics, attitudes and political beliefs. Since the control of higher learning shifted from the clergy to successful business men in the eighteenth century, academic freedom was permitted in the area of religion. Current data reveals that while a majority of board members still approve academic freedon in religious matters, they oppose the same free pursuit of knowledge when it concerns social, economic and political issues. Today's trustees are more sympathetic to the values of the academic community than their off-campus peers. But when their attitudes are studied in relationship to the aims of higher education, data showed that approximately one out of three would feel that "the university is best run along the principles of a business enterprise." They therefore tend to view faculty members merely as employees rather than competent scholars, and give the administration -- along with decision-making powers affecting educational and institutional quality -- authority to select, hire, retain, and fire instructors. There is a need to reappraise the relationship between the aims of higher education and the control of universities."

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

HARNETT, RODNEY T. "College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes." Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968. (Sponsoring agencies: American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C. and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.) Available from Institutional Research Program for Higher Education, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

"In Fall, 1967, Educational Testing Service joined with Morton Rauh, Vice President for Finance at Antioch College, to carry out a large scale survey of members of college and university governing boards. A questionnaire was mailed to trustees of over 500 institutions. From the responses of more than 5,000 board members extensive data concerning who trustees are, what they do, and how they feel about current educational issues were compiled. The information gathered ranges from their religious and educational background, to their political and social views, to the extent of their knowledge of current literature on higher education, to their financial donations to colleges, and so on. Part I of the report summarized selected portions of the data to arrive at a general description of trustees and how they function. Part II, essentially a manual of data, is intended to provide interested observers (particularly participants in the study, college and university officials, and researchers) with a more detailed compilation of the questionnaire responses. Much of the discussion in Part I and all the summaries in Part II are presented by institutional type, such as public or private university or college. It is anticipated that more reports based on these data will be forthcoming from Educational Testing Service."

April 1969, Volume 4, Number 4

HERRIDGE, EILEEN, ED. "Board-President Relationships." Papers form a Series of Conferences for Community College Presidents and Their Boards of Trustees. Midwest Community College Leadership Program, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1967.

The Midwest Community College Leadership Council is a cooperative agency of the University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and Michigan State University. It has sponsored conferences for trustees and presidents of newly formed junior colleges. Ten representative addresses from the conferences, collected in this paper, cover different aspects of the role of the president, the trustee, and the regent, the relationship between board and administrator, the importance of occupational education, the functions and value of a consultant, and the formation and organization of a college. The document also gives the by-laws of the Michigan Association of Community College Boards and details of its organization.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

"Third Interim Report of the Special Committee of the Trustees; Statutes, Chapter II, The University Senate." New York: Columbia University, May 12, 1969.

In their third interim report, the Trustees of Columbia University responsed to a proposal on the participation of faculty and students in the governance of the university on the niversity-wide level. Specifically, they adopted an Executive Committee resolution to establish a representative University Senate. The resolution had earlier been overwhelmingly approved by a vote of almost 44 per cent of the faculty and students. The Special Committee recommended that the Deans of Columbia College and Graduate Faculties be included in the Senate membership and clarified the role of the Trustees. Accompanying the report are the Statutes of the University related to the establishment of the new Senate. The Statutes contain provisions on the election, eligibility, recall and terms of office of faculty, students, administrators, and other representatives, and on the responsibilities and powers of the Senate.

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 8

SAPPER, CHARLES KENNETH. "Selected Social, Economic, and Attitudinal Characteristics of the Trustees of California's Public Junior Colleges." Berkeley, California, 1966. University of California, 1966. Available from University Microfilm, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. (Order No. 66-15, 319, M.F. $8.00, Zerography $9.90)

In spite of the social trust placed in junior college boards, we have no published research on the members' characteristics. Since California has led in setting up a legal basis for junior college growth, this study analyzed certain attributes of the state's trustees. Assumptions were that trustees (1) formulated basic policy, (2) acted out of personal responsibility to a public trust, (3) reached decisions via personal experience and insight. Behavior research found that people, including trustees, do not function in selfless disinterest, but within the limits of their own attitudes and experience. To gather data, the author used a questionnaire (248 responses) and conferences with 55 trustees of 12 districts. He found the following profile: the trustee is male, 40-60 years old, Republican, Protestant, white, married, has two children, is active in civic groups, has at least a B.A., and earns 15-20,000 a year. He wants service for both more full-time and all non-transfer students continued open-door and no-tuition policies, an improved college image, more centralization between counseling and general education, and a real change in the life of the student. His greatest task is choosing a chief administrator, his main source of advice on district problems. He is generally satisfied with his own district's program. The author discusses in detail the three major implications of this study, concerning both the advantages and shortcomings of the current socio-economic composition of the boards.

THE OFFICE OF THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

November 1968, Volume 3, Number 11

GRAHAM, ROBERT GENE. "The Junior College President's Job-- An Analysis of Perceived Job Performance and Possible Influencing Variables." Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Texas, Austin, May 1965.

After surveying the literature on leadership qualities, the author analyzed them according to the leader's own perception of his activities. Questionnaires with 64 items went to 242 junior college presidents, of whom 194 replied. The 182 usable replies were rank ordered by three variables (school, size, location, and reporting authority) and by five years of administration (planning, organizing, leading, controlling, and assessing). The respondent indicated the degree of importance he attached to each duty and noted those he delegated. Delegated duties were given a rating of 0, while those considered most important were rated at 6. In the larger schools, certain items received less importance (or more delegation). No particular pattern of response was shown by geographic area. The replies of the 110 presidents answering to a board and the 72 answering to a superintendent showed a slight tendency for the latter to find their duties more important than did the former. In the administrative areas, all found assessment the most important, followed by organizing, controlling, planning, and leading. Only slight differences were noted by geography or reporting authority. Implications of the findings were examined.

June 1969, Volume 4, Number 6

HARPER, WILLIAM A. "Like It Is, Report of a Workshop for New Junior College Presidents and Their Wives," University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles Junior College Leadership Program, October, 1968.

At this workshop, opinions were expressed on the value of certain attributes of a president, such as: his personal qualities of self-esteem, intelligence, patience, and idealism; his role as an example to school and community; his integrity and human warmth; his interest in young people; an ability to work hard under pressure without loss of identity; intellectual leadership, both on and off campus; managerial leadership to encourage, inspire, and direct others; ability to delegate authority; willingness to make decisions; agreement with his school's philosophy and practices; and professional alertness to trends and innovations. There were also different ideas on the role of the president's wife: she should be much in the background, but accept responsibility when appropriate; serve as a leader of other women when necessary; understand education in general; see that her husband's home life provides respite from his pressures and problems; calmly accept public scrutiny and even criticism; refrain from speaking out on college operations; take part in faculty wives' activities; attend any social obligations that create or contribute to good college and community relations; be concerned with her public appearance, attitude, and conduct; involve herself discreetly in cultural and civic affiars; be socially aware and flexible; retain her individuality. The president as perceived by other groups, current problems of junior college in general and president/faculty relationships were also discussed.

PRATOR, PALPH. The College President, Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

An analysis of the office of the college president and its relation to the special processes of higher education by a man presently engaged in the work of the presidency. The book deals with the historical background of the office and its nature, the relationship between the president and other persons and organizations within the institution, the presidency as part of the institution's continuum and the personal and professional qualifications desirable for the office. Mr. Prator portrays the president as the central figure of the college or university and the one most responsible for their eventual success and image. The personal qualities of the president should include prudence, courage, fortitude, justice and especially resilience. (This last because every day of his professional life will be spent working with people and their problems.)

November 1968, Volume 3, Number 11

ROUECHE, JOHN E. AND NATALIE RUMANZEFF. "The College President--A Bibliography (With Annotations on the Junior College Presidency) California: University of California, Los Angeles, May 15, 1968.

Part I of the Bibliography is a compilation of 70 references concerning the college presidency. In Part II, the authors have briefly reviewed each of 24 documents specifically related to the junior and community college presidency.

ROUECHE, JOHN E. "The Junior College President," Junior College Research Review, Volume 2, Number 10, June 1968.

With new junior colleges opening at the rate of more than one per week and the estimated demand for new chief administrators subsequently reaching 100 annually (between 1965 and 1980) a shortage of qualified personnel to serve in top administrative positions has become evident. Most presidents are selected from within their respective states, 52.4 per cent have master's degrees, 44.1 per cent have doctorates, and junior college presidents generally are 50 to 53 years of age. Slightly more than half (50.4 per cent) of the presidents come from the junior college field, and of this number all but one per cent come from the public junior college. Others are drawn from four-year colleges and universities (15.9 per cent). Increasingly, junior college presidents are being drawn from fields other than higher education. At the level of their highest degrees, most presidents specialized in some area of professional education other than higher education while 8.4 per cent majored in higher education (including junior college administration). Today's junior college president, in addition to being somewhat older than his predecessor of previous decades, has attained a higher degree of education, has acquired more administrative experience in higher education, and has had more junior college experience.

October 1968, Volume 3, Number 10

SHANNON, WILLIAM GEORGE. "The Community College President--A Study of the Role of President of the Public Community Junior College." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Columbia University, Teachers College, New York, 1962.

A 77 per cent response to a questionnaire sent to 312 public community college presidents led to observations which included the following: (1) Although presidents spent most of their time in matters of staff, public relations, financies, and students, they preferred to work with staff, curriculum development, public relations and students. (2) Presidents believed that the most neglected areas were alumni, legislation, students, and professional activities. (3) Presidents saw themselves as educational leaders on the campus and in the community. (4) Presidents believed that community colleges should be autonomous institutions. Major implications were stated in three areas: (1) Presidents must be prepared to administer autonomous institutions and to interpret the college role to lay and professional groups. (2) Administrator preparation programs should recruit from varied sources and should broaden the administrator's understanding of educational theory, sociology and technology. (3) Democratization of higher education should be a primary concern of the community college president.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE

BLACKWELL, THOMAS EDWARD. *College and University Administration.* *The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., New York, 1966.*

The book is divided into eight major areas control, coordination and organization of higher education, the relationship between the corporate board and the office of the president, the academic part of administration, the function of the library in the administrative structure, the organization and administration, patterns of organization for public relations, add research designs for improving administrative efficiency. Dr. Blackwell believes that sound principles of organization and administration must be observed when administering higher institutions of learning, if such institutions are to make their maximum contribution to society. High quality administration cannot and will not be provided by untrained, politically selected administrators.

BOLMAN, FREDERICK deW. *"The Administrator as a Leader and Statesman,"* *Stress and Campus Response,* *G. Kerry Smith, Editor. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Inc. 1968.*

It is Bolman's opinion that today's problems facing administrators are many. He has singled out the new student ethos, the new demands of faculty, the requirements of interinstitutional planning, and cost-benefit controls as precondition for systems analysis of management for discussion. Educational administrators must be formally trained to deal with these problems and the problem of continuing changes in the relationship of education to society if they are to be effective.

November 1968, Volume 3, Number 11

DREWRY, GALEN N. *"The Administrative Team--What It Is and How It Works."* *Athens, Georgia; University of Georgia, Institute of Higher Education, 1967.*

This monograph delineates the concept of a college administrative team. A framework of membership and functions is proposed, and basic guides for team operation and interaction are suggested. Refinement of the administrative team concept and experimentation with techniques are needed. Initial efforts made in a few colleges indicate that the administrative team approach may be of great value as a means for improving college administration.

October 1968, Volume 3, Number 11

"Exploring the Tasks of the Community Junior College Administrator." Proceedings of the Junior College Administrative Teams Institute, University of Florida, Gainesville, 1961.

In a conference of 107 presidents and other administrators from 42 junior colleges in the southeastern states, attention was given to (1) the overall organizational structure of the junior college, (2) the purposes, operation, and administration of student personnel services, (3) institutional research, (4) management, with emphasis on finances, and (5) faculty recruitment and personnel administration.

June 1969, Volume 4, Number 6

GADDY, DALE. "Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines." University of California, Los Angeles, December, 1968, Unpublished paper.

This paper deals with the legal aspects of student rights and of the various forms of expression (riots, demonstrations, speeches, and writings) pertinent to student activism, militancy, or agitation. It cites examples of such activities, along with decisions handed down by school authorities and local, state, and federal courts. The most recent case reviewed is Barder vs. Hardway in the spring of 1968. Following the trends indicated by these decisions, the author offers guidelines to college administrators. They cover general principles such as avoidance of ambiguity or inconsistency, wide dissemination of information on the college rules, the extent of authority over behavior on or off the campus, the distinction between substantive and procedural due process, and the proper conduct of formal and informal hearings. Recommendations include: (1) a spirit of reason on the part of all concerned; (2) the formulation and enforcement of just rules and regulations for freedom of expression on campus, and (3) the channeling of student dissent into constructive activism, leading to increased academic freedom for all.

July 1969, Volume 4, Number 7

HALLER, LOLA MARIE. "The Future Role of the Highest Ranking Women Student Personnel Administrator in the College or University and a Suggested Training Program." Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1967.

This study sought to define the future role of the highest ranking woman student personnel administrator in a college or university and to suggest an appropriate training program. Data on relevant historical factors, influential background and educational characteristics, potentially influential educational and societal concepts, and suitable characteristics and background were obtained from the literature and by interviews with acknowledged leaders in college student personnel administration. Findings indicated that the role of these administrators is shifting from basically custodial to primarily administrative and educational. The new role may involve some administrative responsibility in coordinating personnel services and working with students of both sexes, and interpretation of women's special educational needs to students, faculty, and administration. The recommended doctoral program would be interdisciplinary, with course work in such areas as psychology, sociology, business, and personnel work together with an internship. Further research on recruitment, motivation, and other topics was also urged.

February 1969, Volume 4, Number 2

HARKNESS, BRUCE. "The Chairman and the Dean," Associated Departments of English Bulletin; Number 19, October, 1968.

The role of the English chairman and his relations to students, faculty, and administration are discussed. Some of his "over-riding" problems are considered, but emphasis is given to future problems which may result from an "administrative-dominated" college. The article concludes that despite the problems and indications of future pressures from society, the "super-board," and the students, the department chairman will be in a position to make a positive contribution to the educational community.

HENDERSON, ALGO D. "The Administrator/Student Conflict," Administrative Law Review, Volume 21, Number 1, November, 1968.

Colleges are undergoing a transition from having responsibility for the protective care of students in loco parentis to the position of treating and counseling students as young adults. Many administrators are academic specialists, but are not prepared to respond to the basic question raised by students about the university's role as an educational institution and its role in society. The growing permissiveness of parents and exposure to today's communications media have produced more sophisticated college-age children over whom administrators can no longer assume an arbitrary authority. Administrators are usually confronted with problems arising from one of two sources: (1) militant student and faculty insistence that the institution should take leadership in social action, and (2) student pressure for change in the institution itself. The numerous criticisms that evolve from these sources seem to be justified. Unfortunately, many administrators have resisted new ideas and maintained bureaucratic modes of administration, actions that have turned student agressions from the solution of educational programs to the achievement of student power. It is suggested that administrators be more qualified for their responsibilities. It is felt that they should have qualifications in addition to a reputation as a scholar of a scientist, in order to communicate effectively with modern students.

HEYNS, ROGER W. "Stress and Administrative Authority," Stress and Campus Response, G. Kerry Smith, Editor. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Inc., 1968.

Hayns feels that the current crisis in higher education is aggravated by the fact that the historical environment of the university has changed and the academy is "sugglish" in response. The article includes kinds of stress administrators in higher education are currently facing, and the obstacles which act on the administrator to limit his power to make effective changes in response to this stress. The author suggests that qualitive changes in the university can be made by centering more responsibility and accountability on administrators rather than working almost entirely through committees.

PEOPLES, JOHN A. JR. "Critical Issues and Leadership," Washington, D.C.. (Paper presented at conference of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., November 11, 1968.)

The lack of administrative power causes concern today when the outstanding issues in higher education are concerned with questions of student, faculty or other kinds of power. The position that leadership takes in resolving these issues determines whether they become more or less explosive. There is no guaranteed formula for solving the complex problems stemming from new campus activism; the route to one solution can aggravate other problems. But an educational leader should not hesitate to act if his judgment dictates that passivity would not lead to eventual achievement of institutional goals. He should be a catalyst in guiding all vital issues at any of their critical stages into constructive channels.

THE FACULTY AND GOVERNANCE

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 8

ACADEMIC FREEDOM, TENURE, AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR FACULTY MEMBERS IN TEXAS PUBLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. Report to Texas College and University System, Austin Coordinating Board, March 1968.

The statement provides guiding principles designed to help Texas colleges and universities in evaluating the conditions of academic freedom, tenure, and responsibility that prevail on each campus. It suggests that faculty members should be free to pursue scholarly inquiry, and to voice and publish conclusions without institutional restrictions or discipline. Academic responsibility should be shared by faculty, administrators and governing boards, but faculty members in particular should strive for professional integrity, competence in their fields of specialization, and judiciousness in the use of controversial material related to their subject fields. The document also discusses tenure policy, and covers the continuation of faculty members positions, written terms of employment, the phasing out of institutional programs requiring reduction of faculty, and professional procedures for dismissing a tenured faculty member or one whose term contract is unexpired. Standards are recommended in the area of faculty recruitment for adoption by administrators, and in the area of responsible resignation procedures that should be followed by faculty members. The statement was adopted in public higher educational institutions in Texas on October 16, 1967.

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

CAPPER, MICHAEL R. AND DALE GADDY. "Faculty Participation in Junior College Governance," Junior College Research Review, Volume 3, Number 6, February 1969.

The current conflict between faculty and administration will continue to grow and must receive attention from the junior college. Some conflict is natural and neither could nor should be eliminated. Increased faculty involvement in institutional governance will keep undesirable conflict at a minimum and will encourage constructive debate. The usual way for faculty to participate in college governance is through a faculty senate with established channels of policy formation and implementation. Without such an organization, the college can expect increasing pressure from external faculty organizations whose interests may or may not fit the goals and philosophy of the institution.

July 1969, Volume 4, Number 7

CLARK, BURTON R. "The Role of Faculty Authority." (Paper presented at the University of California Deans' Conference, Berkeley, California, May 1967.

A strong trend toward a federated structure in colleges and universities is affecting faculty authority by weakening faculty as a whole and strengthening the faculty in its many parts. The collection of professional experts on one campus represents a system of groups with similar status and power that co-exist or battle with each other within the structure. At large universities faculty authority resembles what is called "professional authority" in hospitals, industry, and research and development laboratories. But where peer professionals in these other organizations work closely toward one goal, faculty authority is divided between departments, colleges, and separate or allied disciplines. Faculty influence on campus is enhanced by the growing availability of external sources of support such as grants from the federal government, and a labor market which is highly favorable to the professor. The basic weakness of this federated structure is that chaos may occur if there is no strong leadership to channel the efforts of and immediate conflicts between the groups. The university president should serve as mediator, unify the diverse groups on campus and at the same time maintain the overall objectives of the institution in order to "move the whole enterprise another foot ahead."

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

DYKES, ARCHIE R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making. Report of a Study for the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Personal interviews with a random sample of 106 faculty members of a large mid-university dealt with the role of faculty in decision making on academic, financial and student affairs, personnel matters, capital improvements, and public and alumni relations. While the faculty members interviewed indicated that faculty should have a strong, active, and somewhat controlling influence in decisions, particularly in the areas of academic affairs and the educational program, they tended to give research and other professional activities precedence over active decision making in their system of priorities. The most significant finding on how faculty members participate is that the departmental staff meeting was generally considered to be the only instrument of participation that was useful. A marked discrepancy between what the faculty percieved its decision making role to be and what it actually is may be the result of a communication gap between faculty and administration. The source of much faculty-administration tension is that many faculty members believe that increased administrative power would result in decreased faculty power. The fundamental problem is that the misunderstanding of administrative authority and the consequent separation of powers forestalls effective leadership, and without the collective efforts of administration and faculty the definition and attainment of institutional goals is impossible.

April 1969, Volume 4, Number 4

HIXSON, RICHARD A. "A Position Paper." Speech given for a Collective Negotiation in Education Workshop, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1968. American Federation of Teachers, Department of Colleges and Universities.

This position paper covers possible problems of collective bargaining. (1) The two sides should not bring prejudgments of good or bad to the negotiating table; (2) neither side should exaggerate its strength or minimize its weakness; (3) neither side should confuse intransigence with firmness; (4) the composition of each team must be carefully considered to be sure the most competent negotiator is chosen; (5) the use of outside specialists should not be scorned; (6) each team must have real authority to speak for its side, as well as the full confidence of those it represents; (7) contract terms should be realistic, not timid or excessive, and should have the welfare of the whole community in mind; (8) the timing, scheduling, place of meeting, and agenda should be agreeable to both sides.

May 1969, Volume 4, Number 5

MANN, JACINTA. "Faculty Participation in College Governance: Two Small Catholic Colleges," June, 1968. Unpublished paper available from Educational Resources Information Center, U. S. Department of H.E.W.

An evaluation of faculty participation in administration was conducted at two Catholic liberal arts colleges in Winter 1967-68. Of the total lay and religious faculty selected at both institutions, almost 50 per cent responded. The 59-item questionnaire dealt with the full-time faculty's perception of what academic governance is, what their role should be, and satisfaction with their actual role. It also asked for personal data--level of education, rank, tenure, professional societies, research and campus activities. Both the men's and women's college faculties felt that they should have the major voice in academic decision making but that joint faculty-administration decisions should govern religious and lay personnel matters, financial, student, public and alumni affairs. In the area of capital improvements, the men wanted less administrative responsibility than the women. Dissatisfaction with actual decision-making roles was evident, but in the area of faculty-administration relations the women were less satisfied than the men, who were indifferent. The religious held higher degrees and academic ranks than the lay faculty, who were younger and stayed at the college for shorter periods. Both groups often participated in campus activities. A comparison of 33 pairs of mean weights for religious and lay faculty at each college revealed that on all but 7 of the 66, differences between the two groups at both colleges were insignificant, i.e., on nearly all variables concerning shared governance, agreement between the faculties was almost unanimous. Ten recommendations are appended.

MAYHEW, LEWIS B. "Faculty Demands and Faculty Militance," The Journal of Higher Education, XL (May, 1969).

This article discusses the various causes underlying current faculty militancy and some reasonable responses to it. Mr. Mayhew suggests that boards of trustees, presidents, and other administrative officers must be prepared to surrender some of the prerogatives which historically they have assumed and utilized and that administrative officers must be prepared to act in a non-coercive or non-vindictive fashion and in full consultation with those affected by their decisions. It is further suggested that some of the militancy of faculties is the result of insecurity, training and narrow frame of reference and that these things must be considered in administration planning and procedures. Constructive response to stress can contribute to new levels of growth within the institution.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

MITCHELL, MAURICE B. "Faculty Power and the U.S. Campus," Denver University, Denver, Colorado.

Most observers of today's academic scene would concede that the faculty is the power center of U.S. higher education. They decide what is taught, how it is taught, and who is taught. They also exert influence on institutional policies concerning size and selectivity, and determine their own permanent membership through recommendations on promotion to tenure. Tenure preserves academic freedom, but it also preserves mediocrity on almost every U.S. campus. Once given, it is nearly impossible to revoke, and has therefore forced many universities to retain teachers whose value to the institution is nil and whose lack of ability impedes the process of education. The power reflected in the present faculty structure and the implications of tenure deserve serious regard by everyone concerned with the modernization of U.S. higher education. It may be asked what constructive purpose tenure serves in a society that provides constitutionally for freedom of expression. The willingness to reconsider and change time-honored methods and facilities, and the decisions made on innovation will shape the future of U.S. education. We cannot afford to accept any element in the structure of higher education as a "sacred cow" at a time when the university is more than ever looked to by society as a primary source of leadership.

November 1968, Volume 3, Number 11

NEWBURN, H.K. AND OTHERS. "Junior College Administrative Conference. Papers read at the Junior College Administrative Conference, Arizona State University, December 6-7, 1967.

A major paper at the conference concerned that role of the faculty in junior college governance, emphasizing that effective faculty participation requires (1) adequate representation of the faculty, (2) effective communication between faculty and administration, and (3) faculty authority in those areas legitimately within its power. A second speaker discussed the following topics concerning administrative personnel: (1) the relationship of the board and president, (2) the relationship of the board and other administrators, (3) the over-all role of administrators, (4) the relationship of the president and the public, and (5) the role of legal advisory services.

May 1969, Volume 4, Number 5

ROHFLEISCH, KRAMER. "Some Limitations on Faculty Involvement in Academic Government." Washington, D.C. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, November 11, 1968.

The standards faculty have set for their own participation in academic governance seem to apply to another iess complicated world, for their involvement can definitely reach a point of diminishing returns--both to the irdividuals concerned and the educational process. In the California state university system, faculty government has developed to an advanced level although the cry of "all power to the faculty" is still heard. But if the faculty is heavily involved (often 10-15 hours a week) in many facets of an extremely complex state administrative structure, who will teach (except perfunctorily) or do research? The results of overestimating the faculty's capacity for self-government are: waste of precious trained manpower, loss of talent as many faculty members completely abandon administrative responsibilities or become full-time administrators, emergence of the professional "politico," and more important, further fragmentation of knowledge and the educational process since there is no general agreement within academic senates on the ends of education. The culture, graduate schools, and desire for professional status all nurture specialization. To preserve the faculty as faculty, institutions should be jointly operated by faculty, students, and administrators. If administrators demonstrate respect for faculty views and participation, there is hope that faculty members will realize their limitations and concentrate on policy matters while administrators tend to the store.

ROMAN, PAUL A. "San Diego City College Academic Senate: A Critical Evaluation." June 6, 1968. Educational Resources Information Center, January 1969, Volume 4, Number 1.

An assessment of the relationship of the Academic Senate to the faculty and administration at San Diego City College. The Senate's effectiveness in terms of recommendations to the administration and the governing board, and the Senate's effectiveness in its communication with the individual faculty members, a tabulation of the Senate's more than 240 resolutions which were passed between January 1964 and June 1966 was made. The resolutions fell into three categories: (1) housekeeping (budget), (2) academic design of new courses, and (3) personal (faculty load). A poll of 138 faculty members showed that (1) 75 per cent believed that the Senate considered minority opinions of the faculty "most of the time," (2) 90 per cent felt that the Senate's decisions "generally or almost always" agreed to keep informed about the actions of the Senate by reading the minutes of the Senate, and (4) 5 per cent of the faculty indicated that they had attended meetings of the faculty senate. The author concluded that the faculty was pleased with the actions of the Senate and that there were no major problems with lines of communication.

THE STUDENTS AND GOVERNANCE

ACADEMIC FREEDOM: RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDENTS. Revision Ombudsman Proposal, adopted 1968. Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State College, October 15, 1968.

An Ombudsman Proposal Committee met from Spring through Summer 1968 to consider establishing an ombudsman at Colorado State College. The Ombudsman concept is aimed at bridging the gap between a governing administrative structure and the constituents of that structure. The basic features of the ombudsman are that: he is an officer of the legislature not the executive; he assumes an impartial position and is politically independent of the legislature; he has no authority to alter a decision already made by the courts, legislative or administrative body; he is free to investigate on his own initiative; he can perform his duties in an informal, direct, speedy and inexpensive manner. Lacking the opportunity to learn the administrative structure and as transient members of the campus, students need such a channel of communication. The recommendations of the committee (which were later voted on and adopted) included a general over-view of what the Ombudsman of Colorado State College should be; how the office of ombudsman should be established; and what were the basic structure, authority and responsibilities of the office. The composition and duties of the Ombudsman Appointment Board were outlined. Members of the committee were acting representatives of the Associated Students and Faculty Senate. A document on "Academic Freedom, Rights and Responsibilities of Students," which was submitted for ratification to the Faculty Senate, Student Council President and Board of Trustees, is included.

FREEDMAN, MERVIN B. The College Experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1967.

This book discusses studies done by Dr. Freedman and others in the areas of the effect of the college experience on students and society, personality development during and after the college years, sexuality in college, the education of women, drugs on campus, the roots of student discontent, and possible new alignments of power and authority in institutions of higher education. Dr. Freedman believes that most of today's college students are unsophisticated, conventional and stable, and that small individual personality changes in college students can have a cumulative effect on society. He seems favorable toward many of the current approaches to curricular and administrative change and considers them to be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. The evolutionary goals of college students to which the faculty and administration must respond are: 1) the restoration of viable communities in colleges and universities and in society at large; 2) the introduction of unity into the intellect and the personality; 3) the establishment of the ethic of social service as a powerful motive in modern life; 4) the freeing of the impulse of man.

October 1969, Volume 4, Number 10

HALLADAY, S.W. AND OTHERS. "The Role of the Student." Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., November 1968.

Participation in some areas of university governance is recommended in these four statements as an acceptable student role. The first statement describes "legitimate student demands" as those concerned with the quality of the educational experience as they relate to the stated objectives, purposes, and resources of the institution. In the solution of relevant problems, students should be permitted to participate on a broad scale in university committees and councils to introduce a fresh point of view in reasoned dialog. The promise of the second statement is that reciprocity is the vital ingredient in healthy human relationships. Student, faculty, and administrative leadership are crucial mutually reinforcing elements in the shaping of any institution committed to learning. The third statement places emphasis on the student as an individual with human feelings, needs, and desires. The administration and faculty should allow the student to be an active participant in the college community, and should contribute to his individual development by seeing that the results of his participation are both productive and educational. The fourth statement presents three ways in which a student's role should develop, but for the present suggests that students serve on committees that have been under faculty control. Mutual trust and respect must be developed in order to attain the ideal view of the university as a community of scholars.

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 8

MINNINGEE, W. WALTER. "Student Demonstrations and Confrontations." Paper presented to the Convention of the Kansas Association of School Boards, Topeka Kansas, January 14, 1969.

Student unrest in high schools as well as in colleges can be understood as the reflection of a basic problem in communication between students as senders and the school as the receiver-responder. Today's well-informed youth seek change in accord with their ideals but are not heard by those in authority who support traditional interests and values. The school board is responsible for selecting school administrators with leadership which attempts to understand, that listen to students and not be threatened by conflict. Key principles include looking for latent issues in communications from students, recognizing the importance of expectations and mutual respect, and acknowledging the inevitability of change.

October 1969, Volume 4, Number 10

MITAU, G. THEODORE. "Student Participation in Campus Government," St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota State College Board, February 18, 1969. Paper presented to Student Convocation, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota, February 18, 1969.

Encourages educators in the United States to admit that there is much merit in student desires for participatory campus governance, without which colleges and universities may cease to exist as viable and dynamic centers of intellectual growth. But the student's right to speak, protest, organize, and demonstrate for greater social justice and their perception of a more mature society must be safeguarded within the framework of campus law. Three considerations are offered that could ensure continuous inter-communication between students, faculty and administrators. First, each campus should have an up-to-date table of organization that reveals the major decision-making agencies and responsible personnel. Second, each student leader should have a clear-cut understanding of his campus organization, and take responsibility for explaining it to his fellow students. Third, student leaders and faculty members should be continuously informed on the status of their suggestions, petitions, and requests in the campus governmental structure. A part of the educational experience should be experimentation with structures within which students, faculty, and administrators may solve problems in environment of mutual respect and trust.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

"Report of the University of Minnesota Task Force on Student Representation." Minnesota University, Minneapolis, January 2, 1969.

In May 1968, the President of the University of Minnesota appointed a task force to study the question of student representation in the University Senate and in individual campus assemblies, and to explore ways in which students might be elected to serve. The task force noted that although students were well represented on many committees, the University Senate remained largely a faculty body. It recommended incorporation of students as full participants in the Senate and Assemblies and increased student membership in Senate and Assembly committees. Specific recommendations were made regarding: the constituencies, election, term of office, and eligibility of student senators; the number of students on various Senate committees and their selection and election; student Assemblymen; the number of students on various Assembly committees and their selection.

February 1969, Volume 4, Number 2

SCHWARTZ, EDWARD. "Student Power: In Response to the Questions." Paper presented at 51st Annual Meeting of American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.

In order to make the student quest for power more readily understandable, it is necessary to put forward the general propositions of student demands. The demand for student power arises only after students have become dissatisfied with university policy, when trust between administration and students has broken down. First, students want control over their own affairs, especially in the area of parietal rules where the issue is enmeshed in the overall generational battle over personal morality. Second, within the area of teaching and curriculum, only students are solely concerned about good teachers and judge professors almost exclusively on the standard of their teaching ability. Third, because students are more acutely concerned with the moral implications of the university's financial investments and interaction with the wider community, they contend they should participate in institutional decision making. When leaders of the society and the university resist the kinds of changes that students propose, the students then demand institutional power to enact the changes themselves.

February 1969, Volume 4, Number 2

SINDLER, ALLAN P. "A Case Study in Student-University Relations." Paper presented at 51st Annual Meeting of American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1968.

Much of the outcome of the students' desire to direct their lives on and off campus, to shape university policy, and to involve themselves in controversial public issues will depend on the insight of faculties and administrations. Responding to the pressing issue of University principles and practices in regulating student misconduct, Cornell established a University Commission on the Interdependence of University Regulations and Local State and Federal Law. The Commission comprised roughly equal proportions of administration, faculty, and students, and was given a broad mandate to write a report dealing with all aspects of student affairs, judicial procedures, artistic freedom, freedom of expression, and to include policy recommendations delineating the appropriate role of the University in each sector. Endorsed by all Commission members, the report was widely disseminated on campus and in the community. Stemming from the report were a University Statement of Principles and Policies Governing Student Misconduct, and legislation (largely consistent with the Report) altering the University's adjudicative structure for handling misconduct. Although student ferment and dissatisfaction provoked the re-evaluation of policies, there was surprisingly little student reaction to the report. This was probably because of general agreement with its findings and suggestions and, more importantly because the students realized they had become effective and desired participants in the University's administrative processes.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS ON STUDENT REPRESENTATION IN THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND CAMPUS ASSEMBLIES. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, February 24, 1969.

The Task Force on Student Representation of the University of Minnesota recommended that 75 student representatives be added as voting members of the Twin University Senate, and that the 62 student senators from the Twin Cities campus also serve as voting members of the Twin Cities Assembly. The memorandum sets forth reasons why these constitutional changes should not be adopted and recommends some alternatives to the Task Force proposal. If the proposed changes were to be adopted, it is felt that there would be no organ of university government that would reflect the views of the faculty alone, and adoption plus university adherence to the one-man, one-vote principle would result in student control. It is believed that university government is best when it helps to accomplish the institutions' missions of teaching, research, and public service. Therefore, university items of business could be divided into three categories: (1) those on which students alone should vote, (2) those on which students and faculty should have an equal vote, and (3) those on which faculty alone should vote. Also, students should have an opportunity to be heard on all items, even in cases where they may not vote. The memorandum contains lists of university matters that have been handled by the University Senate for the past ten years. It is felt that responsibility should be redistributed, and that increased decisions on student affairs by students would be desirable.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

WILSON, LOGAN. "Protest Politics and Campus Reform," Administrative Law Review, Volume 21, Number 1, November 1968.

It has been increasingly evident that significant numbers of students are profoundly dissatisfied with the status quo, on as well as off the campus, and many of them are ready to use force and violence to change it. In some instances student activists want more participation in decision making, and in others they seek complete control. The organized black students generally use power tactics to gain concessions for themselves rather than to effect drastic alterations in college structure and function. Despite the ends sought by these various groups and although most of them use confrontation tactics some of the protest reflects legitimate concerns. Instead of adopting an authoritarian posture, it would seem more sensible to acknowledge the presence of student activists, keep their protest within reasonable bounds, and take a hard look at what forms of "participatory democracy" are compatible with the institution's central purpose. For whatever the nature and purposes of the university may be, order on the campus is a necessity, and responsibility for maintaining it must be shared by all members of the campus community. Institutions should be prepared to make functional and structural changes, but it should be emphasized that they exist to serve the larger society rather than to further deamnds of the moment on their campuses. The kind and degree of participation should depend upon individual capability and performance.

COORDINATING PERSONNEL AND BOARDS

July 1969, Volume 4, Number 7

GLENNY, LYMAN A. "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education." California University, Berkeley, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, November 1966.

One of the most influential factors leading to the strengthening of the states role in higher education is the coordinating agency which acts in liaison between both the state and national capitols and the universities. The states continue to experiment with three types of coordinating systems: the voluntary council consisting of public college and university presidents and board members; the single governing-coordinating board for all state supported institutions of higher learning; and (most prevalent) a board, composed of citizens who do not directly administer any public institution, that is superimposed over the governing boards of individual institutions or systems. The movement toward creation of coordinating boards of citizen members giving substantial powers has been accelerated because (1) the agencies are exercising greater political leadership in formulating and advocating policies for developing and expanding higher education, (2) more and more federal grant programs are being oriented toward states rather than institutions, (3) private institutions are becoming more involved in public policy making and coordination for all colleges and universities. Despite the attendant risks to the coordinating agency or individual members, the agency must seek a position of political leadership in order to promote the long-range interests of higher education. An annotated bibliography is included.

November 1968, Volume 3, Number 11

HALL, CHARLES WAYNE. "The Position and Function of the State Officer Responsible for Public Community-Junior College Education." Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, New York, 1966.

This study of the state officer responsible for education in the public junior college was undertaken because of the scarcity of information on this rapidly growing position and its functions. Questionnaires were sent to three groups of leaders in the field. Ninety-three per cent (373) of the college chief administrators, all 31 selected professors of education and all 24 state officers replied. Responses to the four questions was as follows: (1) since the position was being established so rapidly and was still in the formative state, its significant characteristics could not yet be defined, (2) the structural pattern of the state board of education, higher education system, or the junior college system would determine whether or not the position could attract and hold capable officers, (3) the focus of state-level organization was generally directed either to supporting a junior college-higher education relationship or toward coordination and articulation with the secondary schools, and (4) the chief function of the state officer was emerging as general educational leader, state-level spokesman, and leader in the development of state junior college programs and plans.

GOVERNMENTS AND COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

Confrontation or Participation? The Federal Government and the Student Community. A Report to the President of the United States by the White House Fellows Association, October 1968.

In May 1968, President Johnson called upon the White House Fellows Association to develop a plan for bringing outstanding college students to Washington for a series of seminars with government leaders on key issues of the times. The resulting study revealed that communications channels between the federal government and students in the United States were inadequate, and that students felt this communications problem to be symptomatic of a more pervasive problem; a general weakening of the sense of "community" in the twentieth century. While young people are critizing today's America, they are also forging the questions and themes for the American of tomorrow. Activist students, in their attempts to bring about change in institutional structures, are adhering either to confrontation politics--which reflects the belief that U.S. institutions cannot be changed by working within the system but must be confronted from without and forcefully brought to a halt--or to the politics of participation, which involves working within the system to produce change. The form of change that eventually takes place will depend on three factors: the type of leadership that emerges, the capacity of institutions to develop new procedures that provide for student participation, and a personal commitment similar to that of the students. The nine recommendations in the report represent a systhesis of suggestions from students and faculty at approximately 80 institutions throughout the United States.

COOPER, WILLIAM MANSFIELD ET. AL. Governments and the University. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1966.

This is a collection of four speeches by prominent educators in Britian, Canada and the United States. The speeches themselves are a reaction to a statement by John W. Gardner, then secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. His statement was to the effect that government-university dealings were extensive, both government and universities were being changed by these dealings and that educators should be concerned about the direction and extent of these changes. The speakers generally agreed with Gardner's statement and their speeches gave specific reasons why.

KNIGHT, DOUGLAS M. *The Federal Government and Higher Education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

The material contained in this book was the required background reading for all meetings of the Seventeenth American Assembly, a national group concerned with the problems of higher education in the United States. From several points of view the book considers the heavy investment the government has already made in higher education, the history of many of the programs now in effect, something of their state in 1960, and what the issues in this area are likely to be in the future. A main feature is that although government is involved in higher education at all levels there has been no attention given to the long term effect of these programs on higher education and on the needs of higher education as an institution. The Assembly as a whole decided that one approach to solving the problems of government involvement in higher education is to form national planning committees to answer the questions: (1) The way in which coordinated national groups or panels could function as direction and priority givers for higher education in the great discipline areas. (2) The planning of the scale and scope of the physical facilities which higher education will need in the next ten years. (3) The general purposes that higher education can serve. (4) The education of the public as to the ways in which education and the rest of our society interact. (5) Ways in which like-minded universities around the world could cooperate.

THE QUESTION OF FREEDOM AND ORDER IN HIGHER EDUCATION

GALLAGHER, BUELL G. "Who Runs the Institution." Speech read at the Symposium on Order and Freedom on the Campus, sponsored by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Berkeley, July 12-15, 1965.

Mr. Gallagher defines the rights and responsibilities of faculty, student, and administrators in higher education; deals with these responsibilities in terms of what student education as a whole means to today's students and present society; and concludes that the lay governing board is finally accountable for everything that the university is or does that faculties must stand ready to assure full responsibility for the whole of the learning process of every student, that students should force the institution by every legal means to offer a whole education commensurate with their own efforts, and that the ideal institution is the one which runs itself because everyone concerned is cooperating in the running.

September 1969, Volume 4, Number 9

GROSS EDWARD, AND PAUL V. GRAMBSCH. "University Goals and Academic Power." Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

The study compares the background and characteristics of administrators and faculty, and their perceptions of what the goals of the university are, what they should be, and what persons or groups are in positions of real power. An attempt was also made to ascertain how the global characteristics and power structure of the university are related to its goal emphasis and to the goal values of its leadership personnel. The instrument used was a questionnaire that contained a list of 47 university goals and was designed to provide a perceived and a preferred goal structure, both for the overall sample of 68 public and private institutions and for each university in the sample. Study findings revealed that there is more agreement than may be commonly supposed between the views of faculty members and those of administrators. In the analysis of global characteristics and of power structure, clear differences emerged between elitist goals at universities that emphasize intellect, scholarship, faculty interests, and prestige, and "service" goals at universities that stress nonintellective student development, direct service to the community, and satisfaction of outside constituencies. The high degree of congruence between perceived and preferred goals accentuates the selective nature of the United States university, and its tendency to attract and retain faculty and administrators who are in basic sympathy with its goal emphasis.

July 1969, Volume 4, Number 7

HOWE, HAROLD II. "Responsibility and Academic Freedom." Speech delivered at Commencement Exercises, Adelphi University, Garden City, Long Island, New York, June 9, 1968.

Negative attitudes concerning university involvement in activities considered as controversial are hampering the effectiveness of and endangering the university's administration of its internal affairs. Governors, state legislators, local politicians, alumni, and parents form some of the groups that provide financial support, often influence university decisions, and sometimes threaten to withdraw support when an institution attempts to move away from the traditional. Although there is an effective working relationship between the federal government and the academic community, federally-funded university research that does not blend in with institutional goals, and federal approaches to campus disorders that differ from those of the university also represent intrusions into university freedom. As components of groups who influence the direction of higher learning, alumni should protect and defend the right of their universities to questions, analyze, and make constructive judgments on internal matters. Faculty and students should be free to investigate and discuss pertinent issues, and faculty should maintain the right to teach and conduct research on what they consider to be important. Continued infringements upon university functions would eventually suffocate academic freedom and deprive the university of its basic responsibility of training tomorrow's leaders and contributing to the future of higher education and society.

August 1969, Volume 4, Number 8

Report of the University of Minnesota Commission on Campus Demonstrations. Minneapolis: Minnesota University, April 24, 1968.

A commission of 23 faculty members, student, and an alumnus was appointed to study problems arising from student demonstrations at the University of Minnesota in the fall of 1967, and to recommend policies by which the university could deal with such problems. The commission, appointed by the university's president, was to formulate guidelines by which the university could distinguish between peaceful or legitimate, and violent or disruptive demonstrations. The 16 guidelines presented in the report are largely based on existing procedures for enforcement of university policy on demonstrations by punitive actions when all other means have failed. The commission permits and encourages the use of university grounds as a forum for the free exchange and criticism of ideas, but it emphasizes the need for students, teachers, administrators, and other members of the university community to follow orderly demonstration procedures that do not disrupt instructional, administrative, or other functions of the university. The guidelines also discuss distinctions between different types of demonstrations, who should identify, arrest and remove trespassers from the campus, off campus student activities, the use of the university's name, and institutional supervision and control over individual or group misconduct.

October 1969, Volume 4, Number 10

SMITH, ROBERT. "The San Francisco State Experience: What Can Be Learned from It?" Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 4, 1969. Paper presented to special session VIII at the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Illinois, March 4, 1969.

Describes the internal tensions within the San Francisco State College and how they erupted into what may have been the most complex, many-faceted struggle of college upheavals in 1969. Underlying the college's campus disturbances are the rising aspirations of students for experientially-oriented college programs, the surge of minority efforts to gain wide access to higher education, the drive for black and other ethnic studies, and a serious thrust for student power. Also involved is the faculty's alienation and disappointment with the deteriorating conditions of California higher education and the increasingly conservative Board of Trustees which provided a seedbed for their revellion. An ex-president of San Francisco State College presents a list containing 11 of his observations concerning what may have been some ineffective responses to campus disorders. They cover how the administration and faculty handled student challenges, the cleavages and hostilities among individuals and groups which made the resolution of conflicts impossible, minority group power struggles on campus, and attitudes of students, faculty, administrators and the public.

June 1969, Volume 4, Number 6

WILSON, DOGAN. "Campus Freedom and Order." Denver Law Journal, Volume 45, Number 4, October 1968.

Since 1965, there has been a growing incidence of student protests and campus disorders. Some difficulties stem from mistaken notions of the functions and purposes of a university, one of which is that a university is an arena in which members of the academic community line up as adversaries. Maintenance of the status quo is not the answer, for real reforms are needed. The university's size, increased outside involvements, heterogeneity, enhanced importance, enmeshment in processes of rapid social change all enlarge the problems of campus freedom and order. Many institutions must face up to the need for more formalized regulations than they once required because contract rather than status has come to establish many of our standards of social behavior. Governance of higher education becomes more legalistic than it has been in the past; and to prevent outside authority from dictating campus life, members of the academic community will have to reconsider how best to govern themselves. At Brown University, an Advisory Committee on Student Conduct concluded after an in-depth study that the common interest can best be served through a partnership process with students participating in a social system they help to create and enforce. Such studies should be initiated and their recommendations implemented at other institutions. Although membership in the academic community carries special rights and obligations, it does not exempt individuals from legal and moral standards prevailing in the larger community.

July 1969, Volume 4, Number 7

WITMER, DAVID R. "Right of Notice and Hearing, Due Process, and Related Constitutional Rights of Students." Wisconsin Board of Regents of State Universities, Madison, 1969.

Opinions about due process as it applies to the contemporary college campus range from the extreme view that due process as defined and practiced in United States courts of criminal law should be followed on college campuses to the opposite extreme that an educational community must evolve its own "due process" in light of campus objectives and traditions. Reviewing relevant court decisions, the author feels that the following guidelines approach an equitable middle ground. The student must be: (1) given notice of the charges against him and the grounds that, if proven, would justify his expulsion or suspension; (2) given the names of eyewitnesses against him and a report on the facts to which witnesses testified; (3) given a hearing (public if he requests) and the opportunity to confront witnesses against him and to present evidence in his defense; (4) notified of the time, place, and date of the hearing and allowed sufficient time to prepare a defense; (5) disciplined by a duly established body operating under regular procedures; and (6) furnished a report of the findings and results of the hearing for his inspection.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 13 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION